

Hon. Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARNES & NOBLE, INC., et al.,

Defendant.

No. C11-485 RAJ

STANDING ORDER  
FOR PATENT CASES

The following Order applies to all patent infringement cases assigned to  
Judge Richard A. Jones:

Unless another time schedule is necessitated by information provided in the  
Joint Status Report ("JSR"), the Court will hold a Claim Construction Hearing  
("Markman Hearing") approximately 180 days (6 months) from the time of issuance  
of the Court's Order Setting Trial Date and Related Dates (the "Scheduling Order").  
The Scheduling Order will establish deadlines for the standard actions as set forth  
and explained in detail below. The following time frame will apply unless a party  
shows good cause why it should not.

Action	Days Prior to Hearing
• Preliminary Infringement Contentions & Disclosure of Asserted Claims	177
• Disclosure of Preliminary Invalidity Contentions	156
• Expert Witness Reports on <i>Markman</i> issues (if necessary)	129
• Rebuttal Expert Witness Report on <i>Markman</i> Hearings (if necessary)	99
• Preliminary Claim Chart	86
• Joint Claim Chart and Prehearing Statement	56
• Opening <i>Markman</i> Briefs - (24 pages per side)	42
• Response <i>Markman</i> Briefs - (24 pages per side)	28
• <i>Markman</i> Hearing	0 - exact date to be scheduled

PLEASE NOTE: The court will not rule on dispositive motions that raise issues of claim construction prior to the *Markman* hearing, unless special circumstances warrant and the party obtains leave of court in advance of filing.

#### **Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions**

A party claiming patent infringement will serve on all parties a statement of the Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions, which will include the following information: (1) the identity of each claim of each patent alleged to be infringed; (2) the identity of the opposing party's accused device/method/etc. by specific name/model number/etc. for each claim asserted; (3) a chart that identifies specifically where each element of each asserted claim is found within each accused device/method/etc.; (4) whether each element is literally or equivalently infringed; and (5) the priority date to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled, if priority is an issue.

### **Preliminary Invalidity Contentions**

A party opposing a claim of infringement on the basis of invalidity shall serve on all parties a statement of its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions including: (1) the identity of prior art that allegedly anticipates each asserted claim or renders it obvious; (2) whether each piece of prior art anticipates or renders obvious the asserted claims; (3) a chart that identifies where in each piece of prior art each element of each asserted claim is found; and (4) any grounds for invalidity based on indefiniteness, enablement, or written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

### **Expert Reports**

If the parties wish to present expert testimony at the claim construction hearing, the parties will disclose expert reports related to claim construction by the date established in the Scheduling Order. Rebuttal expert reports will be exchanged 30 days later. These dates do not affect the more general expert report deadlines included in the Scheduling Order.

### **Proposed Terms and Claim Elements and Preliminary Claim Chart**

At some point prior to the formulation of the preliminary claim chart, the parties will exchange a list of Proposed Terms and Claim Elements, which will include each term that each party contends the court should construe. Each party will also identify any claim element that it contends should be governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6) as a means-plus-function element. The parties will then meet to identify terms in genuine dispute and facilitate the preparation of the Joint Claim Chart.



1 Claim Chart copies of all patents in dispute, together with the relevant prosecution  
2 history. These documents need not be resubmitted upon briefing. The parties will  
3 have the complete prosecution history available at the court's request. In addition,  
4 the parties will indicate whether any witnesses are to be called, and if so, their  
5 identities. For expert witnesses, the party calling the expert will provide a summary  
6 of the opinion to be offered.

7  
8 The court expects the terms to be truly in dispute, and further expects that the  
9 preparation of the Preliminary and Joint Claim Charts will narrow the terms in  
10 dispute. A party is not allowed to propose a construction when the other party is  
11 unable to respond without leave of court (e.g., in a Response Brief). If a party must  
12 propose a new construction, the Joint Claim Chart must be amended to reflect that  
13 change. At the time of the *Markman* Hearing, the Joint Claim Chart before the court  
14 must reflect the current proposed constructions. Unless the parties obtain leave of  
15 court in advance, the court will construe a maximum of 10 claim terms at a  
16 *Markman* Hearing. *Markman* briefs should therefore be limited to 10 terms that the  
17 parties choose jointly, unless they receive leave of court. The parties should  
18 prioritize claims keeping in mind the twin goals of narrowing the issues and  
19 choosing the 10 claim terms for which a claim construction would be most  
20 productive in terms of setting the groundwork for possible settlement.

21  
22  
23 **Tutorial and/or Court-Appointed Neutral Expert  
and Claim Construction Hearing**

24 The court or the parties can request that the court have a tutorial on the  
25 subject matter of the patent(s) at issue prior to the *Markman* Hearing. In those  
26 instances, the court will schedule a tutorial to occur two to four weeks prior to the

1 *Markman* Hearing. The parties, in consultation with the court, will jointly agree to  
2 the format of the tutorial, including a summary and explanation of the subject matter  
3 at issue. The length of the tutorial will depend upon the subject matter. Visual aids  
4 and suggestions for reading material are encouraged.

5 Alternatively, depending on the technology involved, the court may  
6 determine that the assistance of a neutral expert would be helpful. In such an  
7 instance, the court may direct the parties to confer and, if possible, reach an  
8 agreement as to three experts in the field that would be appropriate to act as a neutral  
9 expert to assist the court during the claim construction proceedings and/or the trial of  
10 this matter. The court will then chose one to appoint as a neutral expert pursuant to  
11 Federal Rule of Evidence 706. In such a situation, the parties will split the cost of  
12 the expert equally.  
13

14 The claim construction hearing will be set for one full trial day (5 hours). If  
15 more or less time is required, the parties are instructed to inform Victoria Ericksen at  
16 (206) 370-8517.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

1           The parties are directed to address any specific concerns with the foregoing  
2 schedule in their Joint Status Report. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
3 16, a schedule set forth in accordance with this order may be modified upon a  
4 showing of good cause. The Clerk is directed to provide copies of this order to all  
5 counsel of record.  
6

7           DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011.  
8

9  
10                               /s/ RICHARD A. JONES  
11                               Hon. Richard A. Jones  
12                               United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### Sample Joint Claim Chart

Claim Language (Disputed Terms in <b>Bold</b> )	Plaintiff's Proposed Construction and Evidence in Support	Defendant's Proposed Construction and Evidence in Support
'123 Patent		
<p>1. A method for mending <b>fences</b></p> <p>[or]</p> <p><b>fences</b></p> <p>Found in claim numbers:</p> <p>'123 Patent: y, z '456 Patent: a, b</p>	<p><b>fence</b></p> <p><u>Proposed Construction:</u> A structure that keeps things out.</p> <p><u>Dictionary/Treatise Definitions:</u> Merriam-Webster Dictionary ("a barrier intended to prevent . . . intrusion").</p> <p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '123 Patent col _:__ ("keeps stray animals out" ); Prosecution History at __ ("this method is more effective than the prior art in reinforcing the fence, and therefore in keeping out unwanted intruders").</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> R. Frost Depo. at xx:xx ("Good fences make good neighbors"); '000 Patent at col _:__; Vila Decl. at ¶__.</p>	<p><b>fence</b></p> <p><u>Proposed Construction:</u> A structure that keeps things in.</p> <p><u>Dictionary/Treatise Definitions:</u> Random House Dictionary ("a barrier enclosing or bordering a field, yard, etc.").</p> <p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '123 Patent col _:__ ("keeps young children from leaving the yard "); Prosecution History at __ ("dilapidated fences meant to pen in cattle are particularly amenable to this method").</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> C. Porter Depo. at xx:xx ("Don't fence me in" ); '111 Patent at col _:__; Thomas Decl. at ¶__.</p>

(or similar format that provides side-by-side comparison)